

In the Office Action, the Examiner modified the Restriction Requirement. Claims 1 – 13 and Species of FIGs. 1 – 6 are joined for examination. The Examiner stated the FIG. 7 remains a non-elected species and asked the Applicants to list any claims directed to FIG. 7.

Applicants cannot identify any pending claims that are directed to FIG. 7.

The Examiner continued in the Office Action stating that in the Specification at page 10, lines 16, 21, “18” should read --18c--. The Examiner also stated that in Claim 1, lines 10, 11, “installation” is incorrect. The Examiner suggested that the word should be --installed--, referring to line 6 of Claim 1.

The changes recommended by the Examiner at page 10 of the Specification have been made by this Amendment. The language identified by the Examiner in Claim 1 has been change to read -- installing--.

The Examiner stated that the Abstract is unclear. The Examiner stated that the Abstract should be rewritten to clearly set forth the invention in a more understandable manner to refer to “ferrite beads”, to FIG. 6 molded cover and to FIG. 7 snap on cover and that the supports or covers include openings for frictionally fitting over leads of a circuit component to secure them in place. The Examiner required that the Title be amended to change “in association with” to read --onto-- or --over--.

The Abstract and the Title have been amended as suggested by the Examiner. The Abstract has further been amended to conform with the 150 word limit.

The Examiner continued in the Official Action, rejecting Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto et al. (U.S. Patent 4,675,629; hereinafter referred to as "Sakamoto") in view of France, Jr. et al. (U.S. Patent 5,990,756; hereinafter referred to as "France"). According to the Examiner it would have been obvious to form Sakamoto inductor 25 in the manner of that of France at 10. According to the Examiner, this would help to maintain the inductor in place during manufacture.

The Examiner continued in the Office Action, rejecting Claims 11 and 12 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over France. According to the Examiner, the recited inductor is shown by France at 10. The Examiner stated that recited use does not overcome a device where structure of a claimed device is shown. Also according to the Examiner, wire 12 is read as a rod.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Sakamoto in view of France. Applicants further respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claim 11 under 35 U.S.C. 102 (e) as anticipated by or in the alternative under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as obvious over France.

Claim 12 has been cancelled by this Amendment. Claim 12 has been substantially included in amended Claim 11.

Claim 11 now clearly recites that the insulative coating conformally coats the toroidal element and substantially fills the aperture of the toroidal element. The rod is clearly recited as piercing the insulative coating to establish a gripping relation between the insulative coating and the rod in an installed orientation with the rod traversing the aperture.

Sakamoto does not disclose, show, teach, suggest or in any way render obvious a conformal coating substantially filling an aperture of a toroidal element and piercing of the conformal coating by a rod to establish a gripping relation between the insulative coating and the rod. Sakamoto discloses no conformal

coating of his magnetic core 25. Sakamoto specifically provides for bonding his ferrite bead 25 to the central conductive member 24 upon necessity by a bonding agent. [Sakamoto; Col. 3, lines 24 – 26]

France discloses a one-piece molded encasement covering a ferrite bead. However, France specifically provides a number of ribs located within a longitudinal aperture of the ferrite bead that protrude radially inward to secure the apparatus to a cable. The encasement and the ribs are integrally formed from a resilient material. France's molded encasement does not substantially fill the aperture of his ferrite bead. [France; Abstract]

Neither Sakamoto, nor France, nor any combination of Sakamoto and France discloses, shows, teaches, suggests or in any way renders obvious an insulative coating that conformally coats a toroidal element and substantially fills the aperture of the toroidal element. Neither Sakamoto, nor France, nor any combination of Sakamoto and France discloses, shows, teaches, suggests or in any way renders obvious a rod piercing the insulative coating to establish a gripping relation between the insulative coating and the rod in an installed orientation with the rod traversing the aperture.

Applicants respectfully aver that Claim 11 is patentable over the art of record.

The Examiner continued in the Office Action, rejecting Claims 8 – 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Vander Heyden (U.S. Patent 4,020,430; hereinafter referred to as "Vander Heyden"). According to the Examiner the Vander Heyden assembly (referring to Vander Heyden; FIG. 3) includes toroidal element 40 and flexible support 38 fritted over rod 10a and retaining the toroid in place. For Claim 13, the Examiner stated it would be obvious to mount the parts in the recited manner.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Examiner's rejection of Claims 8 – 10 and 13 under 35 U.S.C. 103 (a) as being unpatentable over Vander Heyden. Vander Heyden discloses

[A] ground plane for filters that is of composite construction involving resilient metal tines permitting press fit connection of the filters to the ground plane. Further the ground plane is in the form of a rigid plate which insures positive non-yielding compression of the tines in sandwiched position between the filters and the plate. [Vander Heyden; Col. 3, lines 23 – 29]

Claim 8 has been amended to clearly require that the apparatus of the invention comprises a flexible **insulative** tubular support element, and that the mutual interference relation among the rod, the support element and the toroidal element is a **non-conductive** relation. Vander Heyden relies upon the compression of his metal tines 34 between a rigid plate 22 (plate 22 is a metal plate; see Vander Heyden; Col. 2, line 34) and his filters 40. Vander Heyden's filters 40 are in conductive abutting relation with contact portions 10a by virtue of the press fit with spring elements 38. Vander Heyden's spring elements 38 are electrically conductive: "...spring elements 38 which electrically connect the filter bodies to the contact portions 10a". [Vander Heyden; Col. 3, lines 5 – 7]

Vander Heyden does not disclose, teach, show, suggest or in any way render obvious a non-conductive interference relation among a rod, a flexible insulative tubular support element and a toroidal element as presently claimed in Claim 8. Claims 9 – 10 are dependent upon Claim 8. Since Claim 8 is patentable Claims 9 – 10 are likewise patentable.

Regarding Claim 13, Applicants respectfully submit that it is "obvious to mount the parts in the recited manner" only because of the disclosure of the parts and their positions in connection with describing the apparatus of the invention. Said another way, the method of Claim 13 is only obvious when "20/20 hindsight" is employed through the filter of the disclosure of the present application. If the apparatus of the present invention were not disclosed, the method of Claim 13 would not be obvious.

A product and a process of using the product can be shown to be distinctive inventions if either or both of the following can be shown: (A) the process of using as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product; or (B) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process. [MPEP 806.05(h)]

Applicants respectfully submit that the claimed product could be installed using a different method in which (1) the support member is situated upon the rod, then (2) the support member is flexed to permit locating the toroidal member about the support member and rod, then (3) effecting sliding positioning of

the assembly of the support member and toroidal member at an operational locus on the rod. Applicants respectfully submit that Claim 13 is patentable over the art of record and independently of Claims 1 – 10.

Applicants respectfully aver that Claim 1 – 10 and 13 are patentable over the art of record.

The Examiner allowed Claims 1 – 7.

Since Applicants have fully and completely responded to the Official Action, this Application is now in order for early action and such early action is respectfully requested. If the Examiner would deem a telephone conference to be of value in expediting this Application, he is invited to call the undersigned attorney at (972) 758-1955 at his convenience.

Respectfully submitted,



Donald D. Mondul


Attorney for Applicants

Reg. No. 29,957

Law Office of Donald D. Mondul
6631 Lovington Drive
Dallas, TX 75252
(972) 758-1955

Certificate of Mailing by First Class Mail

I certify that this document is being deposited on
May 7, 2003, with the U.S. Postal Service as
first class mail under 37 C.F.R. 1.8 and is addressed
to the Commissioner for Patents, P.O. Box 1450,
Alexandria, VA 22313-1450.



Donald D. Mondul, Attorney for Applicants